DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 341 897 CG 023 992

AUTHOR Becnel, Shirley
TITLE Evaluating the Effectiveness of the Direct Services Provided to Students through the Drug Free Schools Project-Jefferson Parish Public School System.
PUB DATE 30 Oct 91
NOTE 41p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Evaluation Association (Chicago, IL, October 30-November 2, 1992).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Drug Education; Elementary School Students; Elementary Secondary Education; *Prevention; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *School Counseling; Secondary School Students; Substance Abuse
IDENTIFIERS *Drug Free Schools and Communities Act 1986; Jefferson Parish Public Schools LA

ABSTRACT

The Drug Free Schools and Communities Act program for the Jefferson Parish Public School System (JPPSS) in Louisiana is designed to provide a comprehensive and developmental substance abuse prevention education program coupled with an early intervention program. The JPPSS program exists in each of the 84 public schools and a portion of the district's non-public schools. Direct services are offered to public school students at the school sites as part of the regular school program. Services to participating non-public schools are coordinated through a school facilitator. Special activities are planned for adults and community members. An evaluation of the program focused on staff, services, and materials. The progress report indicated that: (1) the level of sustained services to a set of priority schools increased the scope and depth of the program at school sites where extra support was needed; (2) an increase in the number of facilitators resulted in a lower number of schools for each facilitator; (3) the assignment of one facilitator to all non-public schools resulted in a higher level of interest and participation among these schools; (4) the scope of direct services to students improved; (5) the data collection method was expanded to include a district-wide assessment of the program by all principals, school team chairs, and a sample of teachers; and (6) a parent component was being added to the district's program. (Evaluation data are included.) (ABL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED341897

Evaluating the Effectiveness of the Direct Services Provided to Students through the Drug Free Schools Project Jefferson Parish Public School System

Shirley Becnel, Ph.D.
Program Evaluator
Consolidated Educational Programs
JPPSS
Marrero, Louisiana 70072
504-348-2891

CG023992

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting
American Evaluation Association
October 30, 1991

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Shirley Becnel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

1. Preface

2. Evaluation Design

3. End of Year Summary Data (Report to La. SDE)

4. Summary of Monthly Reports

5. End of Year Survey

6. Camp Abbey Data

7. Reach Team Data

A. Preface

The DFSCA program for the JPPSS is designed to provide a comprehensive and developmental substance abuse prevention education program coupled with an early intervention program. The staff includes a district level coordinator, five (5) school facilitators, a facilitator for at-risk students, and volunteer school level personnel, specifically school team chairs and support group facilitators. Assisting in the evaluation of the program are a program evaluator and the computer technology consultant. Supervising the district program is the director for Consolidated Educational Programs.

The Jefferson Parish DFSCA program exists in each of the 84 public schools and a portion of the district's non-public schools. Direct services are offered to public school students at the school sites as part of the regular school program. Services to participating non-public schools are coordinated through a school facilitator. Special activities are planned for adults and community members.

B. Evaluation Design

The evaluation of the DFSCA program focuses on three areas referenced in the district plan. The areas are:

1. staff,
2. services, and
3. materials.

Consistent with the objectives of the project, the evaluation design includes two components:

1. an implementation study and
2. an assessment of effectiveness.

As the DFSCA program is one where some results may not be readily evident for several years, the primary evaluation method used was an implementation study. Implementation data were gathered to assess the following:

a. the type, frequency, and level of services,
b. the perception of administrators, teachers, and school team chairs regarding the DF services,
c. the depth and breadth of school level programs across the school year,
d. the level of training/inservices provided, and
e. the appropriateness of materials as related to program objectives.

The level of effectiveness was measured by analyzing the following data:

a. the monthly report data,
b. the end of year survey data,
c. the facilitator's weekly reporting forms,
d. the evaluations collected after each workshop or activity,
e. the Camp Abbey (REACH team) data,
f. the suspension data regarding substance abuse policy violations, and
g. the REACH team monthly reports.

DRUG FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT
END OF THE YEAR REPORT

Name of LEA: *Jefferson Parish Public School System*

Name of Person Completing Report: *Shirley Becnel, Ph.D.*

Title of Person Completing Report: *Program Developer/Evaluator*

Name of DFSCA Coordinator: *Freddie Landry*

Date: *June 26, 1991*

I. SCHOOL DATA	PUBLIC	NON-PUBLIC
A. Total number of schools participating	*84*	*40*
B. Total number of Non-pubic schools NOT participating		*14*
C. Mandated one hour Teacher Inservice		
1. yes *X* no ____		
2. Number of participating teachers	*3016*	*0*
D. Other teacher/school personnel/central office inservices		
1. Total number of hours	*2343*	*120*
2. Total number participating	*3124*	*159*

II. SCHOOL TEAMS		
A. Student Assistance Teams		
1. Total number of Student Assistance Teams	*28*	*1*
2. Total number of Team Members	*112*	*4*
B. Other Teams		
1. Team Name		
2. Number of Teams	*80*	*10*
3. Number of team members	*400*	*50*
C. Team Activities		
1. Total number of Interventions	*547*	*56*
2. Total number of Parent Conferences		
3. Total number of Referrals		
Inside School	*3105*	*41*
Outside School	*214*	*77*
4. Total number of Community Presentations	*11*	*0*

	Consecutive	Separate Days
D. Team Training Format (Please check one or more if appropriate)		
1. Four days	____	____
2. Three days	____	____
3. Two days	____	____
4. Other	____	____

III. SUBSTANCE ABUSE PREVENTION CURRICULA	PUBLIC	NON-PUBLIC
A. Grades Taught (Total number of schools participating)		
1. K-3 } *Elementary*	56	27
2. 4-6 }	____	____
3. 7-9 - *Middle/Jr.High*	14	____
4. 10-12	8	5
5. All grades	1	3
6. Special Schools	5	4

Elem.

B. Name of Curricula used (Please check)

_X_ 1. Louisiana State Department of Education Curriculum

____ 2. Parish Developed Curriculum

_X_ 3. Other (please specify by name)

1) Project Charlie
2) Quest Skills for Growing
3) Quest Skills for Adolescents
4) Meology 5) Me-Me

C. Number of instructional hours per student	____	____

IV. STUDENT ACTIVITIES		
A. Peer Leadership Training (Peer Education, Peer Facilitation) yes _X_ no ____		
1. Total number of school participating	22	3
2. Total number of students participating in training	731	75
3. Number of training hours	30	30
4. Peer Leadership Training Format (please check one or all if appropriate)		

_X_ (a) Workshop

_X_ (b) Two Day Training

____ (c) Week-long Camp

	PUBLIC	NON-PUBLIC

5. Peer Leadership Activities (please check one or more if appropriate)

- [X] (a) Classroom Presentations
- [ ] (b) Clubs
- [X] (c) Special Projects
- [X] (d) Peer Facilitation
- [X] (e) Newsletter
- [X] (f) Drama/Music
- [X] (g) Fundraiser
- [X] (h) School/Community Leadership
- [X] (i) Other (please list) *Elementary school visits*

B. Support Groups

	PUBLIC	NON-PUBLIC
1. Total number of groups in system	338	12
2. Total number of participants in all groups	2594	417

3. Types of support groups (please check appropriate support groups in your system)

- [X] (a) Substance Abuse/Prevention/ Awareness
- [X] (b) Concerned Persons
- [X] (c) Aftercare
- [ ] (d) Loss/Death/Divorce
- [ ] (e) At-Risk Problem Solving
- [ ] (f) Teen Pregnancy
- [ ] (g) Other (please list) _____

C. General Awareness (Check one or more)

- [ ] 1. Youth Rallies

	PUBLIC	NON-PUBLIC
(a) Number of Participants		
State	0	0
Other	0	0

- [X] 2. School Assemblies
- [X] 3. Video/TV Presentations
- [X] 4. Classroom Speakers
- [X] 5. Field Trips

V. PARENTAL/COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES	PUBLIC	NON-PUBLIC
A. Awareness		
1. Total number of programs	3	2
2. Total number of participants	295	350
B. Skills Development (Self-esteem, Communication, Parenting)		
1. Total number of programs	6	3
2. Total number of participants	162	31

C. Number of Advisory Council Meetings
1. Number of Advisory Council Meetings 2
2. Average meeting attendance 6

D. Special Projects
(Please check)

- X Louisiana Takes A Stand
- X Red Ribbon Campaign
- X Awareness Day
- X Fundraiser
- ___ Drug-Free Zone Activities
- X Video Contests
- X Rallies
- X Other activities (Please list)

Poster contests
Brown Bag Lunch Program
DARE
Student Lock-in

Progress Report

1. List below significant accomplishments of your program during the preceding year.

a. The level of sustained services to a set of priority schools increased the scope and depth of the DF program at school sites where extra support was needed. Note: Priority schools were chosen as a result of the evaluations completed in the 1989-90 school year.

b. An increase in the number of DF facilitators resulted in a lower number of schools for each facilitator.

c. The assignment of one facilitator to all non-public schools resulted in a higher level of interest and participation among these schools.

d. The scope of the direct services to students improved in the following areas: 1) the number of schools with programs/activities spaced throughout the calendar year increased, 2) the number of support groups increased at many school sites, and 3) the level of direct services to students through facilitator sponsored groups and activities increased.

e. The data collection method was expanded to include a district wide assessment of the DF program by all principals, school team chairs, and a sample of teachers.

f. A parent component was been added to the district's program.

2. Describe the extent to which the original objectives of your project are being achieved.

The JPPSS DF program is designed to provide direct services to students, parents, and teachers. The design of the 1990-91 program has addressed the program objectives by: a) increasing the number of DF staff, thus decreasing the number of schools for each facilitator, b) supporting and enhancing the support group concept through direct sponsorship of student groups by the facilitators and by continuous interaction with the school based support group sponsors, c) expanding the audio-visual materials available to the teachers, d) improving the data collection and evaluation techniques, e) sustaining district level inservices for teachers, and f) encouraging community involvement through the Community Mobilization program.

3. Provide a discussion of the method used by you to evaluate the effectiveness of your DF education program.

The following methods are used to evaluate the components of the DFSCA program in Jefferson Parish:

a. post-activity assessments are made at the end of all workshops, meetings, and inservices;

b. pre and post measure designs are used to assess unique components where change is anticipated;

c. monthly reporting forms, which provide data re: the level of program implementation at each site, are submitted to the evaluation office by each school team chair;

d. weekly reporting forms, which provide data re: the level and scope of duties performed by the facilitators, are submitted to the evaluation office and are used as comparative data sets along with the monthly reporting forms;

e. a district wide survey of specific program components is conducted annually;

f. informal observations of staff by CEP director and DF coordinator are made through out the year; and

g. weekly staff meetings and evaluation meetings are held throughout the year.

4. What are the results of the evaluation described in No. 3 above?

1. The restructuring of the facilitators' schedules increased the level of direct services provided to students and teachers by the facilitators.

2. Program strengths and limitations are easily identified and adjustments can be made throughout the year, not just at the end of the year.

3. Inservices and student activities can be tailored to specific needs and can be adjusted in light of the evaluations.

4. An understanding of the district program, as well as cluster and school site activities, provides a better picture of all program components and the degree to which each component contributes to the effectiveness of the program.

5. Each administrator is provided with a summary of DF activities at his school site. This evaluation printout may be used to report on the DF component of the school based instructional action plan required by the district.

Summary of Monthly Reports
Implementation Study Portion
DFSCA Evaluation

DRUG FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT
Monthly Report

SCHOOL: _____ GRADE LEVELS: _____ MONTH: _____
(September only)

SCHOOL TEAM CHAIR: _____ ENROLLMENT: _____
(September only)

____ Number of SAPE team meetings
____ Number of referrals to SAPE Team
____ Number of Student Assistance Team meetings
____ Number of referrals to Student Assistance Teams
____ Number of interventions held with parents
____ Number of conferences with students
____ Number of referrals to community agencies/chemical dependency hospitals
____ Number of substance abuse policy violations

SUPPORT GROUP DATA

Support Group (Type)	Facilitator	Meeting Day(s)/Time(s)	# of min.	# of students

CURRICULUM PROGRAMS (Check if program is in place in your school and was part of the drug free program during this month.)

____ Project Charlie ____ QUEST (Skills for Growing) ____ QUEST (Skills for Adolescents)

____ La. State Curriculum ____ Meology ____ Me-Me ____ Other (name: _____)

DRUG AWARENESS ACTIVITIES

ACTIVITY	TOPIC/TITLE	GRADE(S)	# of students
Use of A/V materials			
Speaker (name)			
Red Ribbon (day)			
Red Ribbon (week)			
Contest			
Rally/Assembly			
Brown Bag Lunch			
Other			

CLUBS

___ SAPE ___ SADD ___ Just Say No ___ TADD ___ Hug Ambassadors ___ Other (name: _____)

MEETINGS/INSERVICES (teachers/parents)

Participants	Topic/Title	# of people participating

Principal's Signature _____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Analysis of Monthly Report Data (Public Schools)

Purpose: To present descriptive data regarding activities and services conducted at the school sites.

Method: Implementation studies procedure was used as it allows for the assessment of a program with long-term project goals that may not be immediately measurable in terms of cause and effect and/or student impact.

Population:

Public schools:

N = 84 public schools

82 (98%) of the public schools submitted one or more monthly reports.
2* (2%) of the public schools did not submit any reports.

*The two schools not submitting any monthly reports were:
Bunche Career Center
Westwego Elementary School

Delimiters

Data cited in this report reflect only those entries recorded on the monthly report forms given to the DFSCA facilitators. The following factors should be considered when reviewing these data:

a. The purpose of the monthly report is to monitor the level of program implementation and the continuity of services. The data obtained from the monthly reports must not be studied in isolation.

b. Submission of a monthly report does not indicate that a drug free program was in place at the school nor does it mean that the program was operating effectively. All reports were entered into the DF data base regardless of their content, even those showing zeroes in some or all of the fields. The content of the reports must be reviewed prior to making final evaluation statements.

c. There was no standard implementation pattern for the DF program at the school level. While certain program elements were mandated, the unique features of each school and the needs of the students influenced the implementation of the program at the school sites.

d. Unanticipated personnel changes influenced the program design at some schools and caused variances in the implementation of the program.

e. The data from the monthly reports can be used as an element in the evaluation of the effectiveness of the administrative staffing design for the district and the over-all district program. However, other data must be considered in order to achieve a comprehensive evaluation.

f. Some school team chairs submitted one form for multiple months. Where data were specifically identified by date, entries were made in fields consistent with the month. When data were not liked to a specific month, data were entered according to the last month listed on the reporting form.

g. When an entry showed a range of numbers, the median number was used.

h. Some school team chairs recorded data in a form inconsistent with the questions, i.e., some people entered narrative data, meeting notes, etc. To the degree possible, data were extracted and placed in appropriate fields.

i. Consideration must be given to the number of reports submitted by each school as the number varies significantly among the schools.

Definition of Terms

School Team Chair: The school based person who acts as liasion between the DFSCA staff and other school personnel.

Support Group: A group of individuals who provide a confidential setting where students may express their concerns. These groups are led by a facilitator.

SAPE Team: A group of school based professionals who screen referrals and make recommendations regarding interventions.

Staffing/Services Data

82 schools submitted at least one monthly report
2 schools did not submit any monthly reports

86 adults who served as School Team Chairs (STC) during 1990-91

276 adults who acted as support group facilitators
338 support groups in place during the year
2594 average number of students in support groups (each month)

Part 1 Meetings Data

SAPE DATA

The drug free program consists of multiple services and activities designed to meet the needs of the students. One important component of the program is the school based SAPE team. Teachers and staff members may refer a student to the team should the teacher perceive a potential problem for the student in the area of substance abuse. The referral information is reviewed by the team and recommendations for interventions are made, if appropriate.

Meetings: Of the 82 schools submitting data, 80 (97%) reported at least one SAPE meeting during the 1990-91 school year. Two (2) schools reported no SAPE meetings during the year and four (4) schools reported only one SAPE meeting. A total of 826 SAPE meetings were held during the year.

Note: The number of meetings at individual school sites ranged from one (1) to thirty-four (34).

No SAPE meetings	One SAPE meeting
Gr	Ad
Ho	Br
	Ma
	Ro

See Attachment E.

Referrals: Sixty-six (80%) of the 82 reporting schools indicated that students were referred to the SAPE teams. Sixteen schools (20%) reported no referrals during the year. A total number of 2261 students were referred to SAPE teams during the year with a range from zero to 246.

Note: There was significant variance in the number of referrals among schools, even those with similiar student populations. Additionally, the level of referrals varied dramatically at some schools with referrals clustered in a single month. The referrals at the high school level were proportionally lower than expected when student enrollment was compared to the number of referrals.

No SAPE referrals

Bi	Li
Bc	Ma
Br	Mc
Ch	Mi
Gr	Pi
Gr	Pi
Ha	Ri
He	Ro

See Attachment F.

SAT Meetings

Meetings: Of the 82 schools submitting data, 26 (32%) reported at least one SAT meeting. Fifty-six schools (68%) did not report any meetings. There were 317 SAT meetings during the school year with the number of meetings at the schools ranging from one to 36.

Referrals: Twenty-eight of the reporting schools (34%) indicated that students were referred to the SAT team. The range of referrals was from zero students to 93.

Note: Two schools which reported no SAT meetings did report student referrals. These schools were: Estelle and Livaudais. Both of these schools reported a comparatively high number of referrals.

See Attachment G, H, and I.

Interventions

Forty-four (54%) of the 82 schools reported 547 interventions during the school year. Note: The range of interventions at individual school sites was from 1 to 192.

See Attachment J.

Conferences

Seventeen (21%) of the 82 schools reported no conferences. Sixty-five (79%) of the schools reported a total of 2146 conferences with the range at the individual schools going from zero to 397. Note: Data re: conferences were sometimes reported in other sections of the reporting form and the figures in this field may not be comprehensive.

See Attachment K.

Referrals to Community Agencies

Thirty-three (40%) of the 82 schools reported referrals to community agencies. Three schools, Gretna Jr., Harris, and Bissonet, were the only public schools with ten or more referrals.

Part 2 Support Group Data

The continuity of the program across the school year is an important aspect of the drug free program. The effectiveness of the services to students is directly linked to a broad based, sustained program. The first measure of effectiveness is the evaluation of the kind and frequency of services across the school year. The criteria used to assess the level of services at each school site were: frequency and scope of program activities throughout the year, number of support groups in place, number of direct contact hours with students, the number of meetings and interventions, and the level of teacher/parent involvement. The descriptive data from the monthly reports showed that 72 (86%) schools documented an comprehensive drug free program that provided a consistent level of services throughout the year, 10 (12%) schools reported an active program, and 2 (2%) schools did not report any data re: their school's drug free program.

One method of providing direct services to students was through the support group model. Students met with school based professionals in a confidential setting to discuss student concerns or needs. These groups were facilitated by teachers, school counselors, and other students.

A review of the support group data showed that 72 (88%) of the 82 schools reported support groups. In total, there were 338 support groups facilitated by 276 adults with an average monthly participation rate of 2594 students. Note: Four of these schools reported only one support group. Ten (12%) of the 82 schools did not report any support groups.

No Support Groups Reported	One Support Group
Bo	Br
Co	Ch (Dec/Feb only)
Fo	Fi (Oct. only)
Gr	Gr (March only)
Gr	
Ha	
Ha	
Mc	
Pi	
Wo	

It should be noted that the availability of support group services varied significantly. A review of the individual school reports will document the availability and consistency of services at each reporting school.

See Attachments L and M.

Part 3 Activity Data

The number and type of activities sponsored through the DF program were varied, however, some variance was expected as each school is unique and student needs vary from school to school. The monthly reports showed that some schools maintained a consistent and varied activity component throughout the school year. Others reports showed a sparcity of activities. The following comments highlight some features that should be considered when reviewing the individual school activity reports.

Note: Consider the organizational level of each school and the number of reports submitted before evaluating the activities section.

School	Observation
Ad	all reported activities occurred in 1st semester
Ba	no activities reported after Jan.
Bi	many activities were "distribution of flyers"
Bo	few activities
Br	nothing reported after Jan.
Br	only reported activities occurred during RRWeek (Oct)
Bo	most activities were t-shirt contests or coloring act.
Bu	nothing reported after Dec.
Ch	need to review activities for second semester
De	few activities from Dec. forward
Do	few activities (scattered)
Do	only one activity reported after Dec.
EJ	no activities reported after Dec.
Eh	only one activity reported after Dec.
El	only one activity reported after Nov.
El	no activities in April and May
Fi	no activities reported after Jan.
Gr	activities show heavy emphasis on AV
Gr	activities were intermittent
Gr	only two reports submitted
Gr	heavy emphasis on speakers
Ha	no activities reported after Feb.
Ha	no activities reported after Feb.
Ha	activities clustered
Ha	heavy emphasis on AV, # students involved low
Ha	activities intermittent
Hi	activities intermittent
Jai	activities intermittent
Kir	few activities
La	activities intermittent
Li	few activities

Li	all activities reported in Oct.
Ma	no activities reported after Dec.
Ma	no activities after Nov.
Mc	no activities or reports after Dec.
Me	activities intermittent
Me	few activities w/most in Jan.
Mi	no activities after Nov.
Pi	activities intermittent 1st sem./none for 2nd sem.
Ri	# of student contacts 2nd semester low
Ro	only two activities reported (March only)
Ru	activities intermittent
St	only two activities (both in Oct.)
Tr	activities intermittent w/none after Jan.
Wa	activities intermittent
Wa	activities intermittent w/most in Oct.
WJ	activities intermittent
We	most reported activities in Oct.
Wo	activities intermittent

Note: Some activities listed in this section may be inappropriate entries. For example, some STCs reported Mardi Gras parades, student council groups, and good behavior recognition activities as drug free activities.

Additionally, Project Charlie activities are referenced in the Programs/Clubs section of the report and are not delineated in the activities section.

Part 4 Program and Club Data

Programs	# of schools
Project Charlie	58
Skills Programs (2)	7
La. State Curriculum	22
Meology	1
Me-me	5
SAPE	27
SADD	6
Just Say No	7
TADD	4
Hug Ambassadors	4
Other*	25

Part 5 Inservice Data

A review of the parent/teacher inservice section of the monthly reports showed that 53 (65%) of the 82 schools reported two or more meetings related to the drug free program. Seven (9%) of the 82 schools did not report any parent or teacher meetings/activities during the year while twenty-two (27%) of the 82 schools reported only one meeting.

Other category - Program/Club Data

School	Other	Explanation
At	x	Manage My Life
Bl	x	Frogs
Bl	x	REACH
Br	x	Peer Communica
Ch	x	Start. Early
Ch	x	Character Ed
El	x	Elephant/livin
Gr	x	Character Ed
Ha	x	Youth Alive
Ha	x	Big Brother
Ha	x	Character Ed
He	x	Character Ed
Ho	x	Defense Initit
IC	x	Drug Ed
Ki	x	REACH
LT	x	LTI Curriculum
Li	x	Alateen
Ma	x	D.A.R.E.
Me	x	SAFE Week
Pi	x	Character Ed
Ri	x	Show Me
Sa	x	Luth. Religion
Sa	x	Lutheran Matl
So	x	SAFE insv./mov
So	x	Science
Tr	x	PALS
We	x	Al-Anon
We	x	AlaTeen

Conclusions

1. The DFSCA program was implemented as designed.
2. The data show that there was a sustained level of implementation throughout the year.
3. The diversity of activities indicated that schools were individualizing the program components without restructuring the essential design.
4. There was a congruency of purpose between the drug free services available to the students and the apparent needs of these students.

Recommendations

1. The reporting schedules must not be compromised. Regular assessment of school site activities is an essential component of the program.
2. Some standardization of purpose and design is needed in the following areas: a) support group names/focus, b) activities sponsored by the DF program, c) the anticipated level of teacher training, and d) the referral process (SAPE and SAT).
3. Efforts should be made to increase the level of activity at those schools with inconsistent programs and 100% of the public schools should be reporting each month.
4. A study of the current staffing patterns as compared to the level of reported activity is suggested. The cost effectiveness and cost benefit factors should be considered.

Analysis of Monthly Report Data (Non-Public Schools)

Purpose: To present descriptive data regarding activities and services conducted at the school sites.

Method: Implementation studies procedure was used as it allows for the assessment of a program with long-term project goals that may not be immediately measurable in terms of cause and effect and/or student impact.

Population:

Non-Public schools:

N = 40 schools

40 schools completed participation forms
29 schools submitted at least one monthly report

Note: Participation by non-public schools was voluntary. These schools were serviced by a Drug Free facilitator assigned the responsibilities of non-public facilitator.

See Attachment O.

Meetings Data

The 29 non-public schools reported the following:

SAPE meetings	55
SAPE referrals	40
SAT meetings	6
SAT referrals	1
Interventions	56
Conferences	140
Referrals to Comm. Agencies	99

Observations:

1. The number of non-public schools submitting monthly reports increased. Note: Although the number of reports increased, the data reported were limited.
2. The implementation of the drug free program varied significantly among the non-public schools.
3. The major difference between the non-public and public school programs was in the area of curriculum where there was a wide range of programs in place at the non-public schools. (See attachment P.)

DFSCA Survey
End of Year Evaluation
1990-91

Purpose: To assess the effectiveness of program implementation as perceived by school site personnel.

Objectives:
1. To gather data re: student needs and the level of services provided via support groups.
2. To gather data re: the DF facilitator as part of the school level program.
3. To assess the level of program activity (Project Charlie or REACH teams).
4. To gather data re: the STC concept.
5. To gather data re: the AV component.
6. To assess the perceived usefulness of the mandated inservices.

Population:

N = 84 schools

Surveys distributed:
84 - principals
84 - STCs
491 - teachers*

*This number reflects a 15% random sample of the total number of teachers reported to the SDE as of 9/90.

Return Ratio:

Population	Distributed	Returned	Not Returned
Principals	84	77 (92%)	7 (8%)
STCs	84	75 (89%)	9 (11%)
Teachers	491	347 (71%)	144** (29%)

**Of the 144 teacher surveys not returned, 39 were the forms sent to the 6 schools which did not return <u>any</u> teacher survey forms. The remaining 105 forms were missing data pieces from schools submitting at least one teacher form. There were two possible explanations for the missing 105 forms: 1) the teachers were no longer assigned to the school and, therefore, could not respond or 2) these teachers were at the schools but simply chose not to participate in the survey. (See attachment A for listing of schools with missing data.)

Survey Instrument

Six separate surveys, printed on scannable sheets, were distributed. The surveys were sent to six groups:

elementary and secondary - principals
teachers
school team chairs

See attachments B through J for surveys and accompanying letters.

A. Analysis of Data

Demographic Data

A. Distribution

N = 76 principals

51 (67%) elementary
17 (22%) secondary
8 (11%) other

N = 75 STCs

48 (64%) elementary
22 (29%) secondary
5 (6%) other

N = 346 teachers

188 (54%) elementary
151 (43%) secondary
10 (3%) other

Conclusions

1. The three reporting groups concurred in their assessment of the DF program as helpful and/or useful in the following areas: a) services to students via support groups and b) level of participation in groups by students in need of such services.
2. The groups agreed that the STC concept and the DF facilitator concept complemented the over-all drug free program at the school site.
3. There was a disparity between the perceptions of the elementary principals and the elementary teachers re: the Project Charlie component.
4. The AV use was reported at a low level by all groups.
5. There was congruency in reported perceptions re: the REACH team by both groups.
6. The level of usefulness re: the mandated inservices was reported as relatively low.

Recommendations

1. Although the number of individuals indicating lower level responses was small, these individuals influence the quality of the program at the school sites. Every effort should be made to identify the source of these perceptions.
2. The AV component should be studied.

DRUGFREE SCHOOLS PROGRAM
Drugfree Services Survey
May 1991

• EXAMPLE
• ERASE COMPLETELY TO CHANGE

27

ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS
PLEASE: Answer All 8 Questions

	A	B	C	D	E
. My school is: [A] Public [B] Non-Public					
. What grade level is your school? [A] Elementary [B] Middle/Junior High [C] High School [D] Other					
. To what extent do the students in need articipate in support groups? [A] very little [B] some [C] a great deal					
. To what extent are the support group services elpful to students in need? [A] very little [B] some [C] a great deal					
. To what degree does the Drug Free Facilitator ssist in the overall drug education program at your chool? [A] very little [B] some [C] a great deal					
. To what extent have you included Project harlie on a weekly basis? [A] very little [B] ome [C] a great deal					
. To what degree does the School Team Chair oncept facilitate the drug education program at our school? [A]very little [B]some [C]a great deal					
. To what extent was the one hour mandated ubstance abuse inservice or Project Charlie nservice useful to you as an administrator? [A] very little [B] some [C] a great deal					
OTE: Answer question 8 here ---> ---> --->					

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

©SCANTRON CORPORATION 1988
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DRUGFREE SCHOOLS PROGRAM
Drugfree Services Survey
May 1991

• EXAMPLE
• ERASE COMPLETELY TO CHANGE

28

LEMENTARY SCHOOL TEAM CHAIRS
LEASE: Answer all 8 questions

	A	B	C	D	E
. My school is: [A] Public [B] Non-Public					
. What grade level is your school? A] Elementary [B] Middle/Junior High [C] High chool [D] Other					
. To what extent are you involved in support roup services at your school? [A] very little B] some [C] a great deal					
. To what extent do the students in need articipate in support groups? [A] very little B] some [C] a great deal					
. To what degree does the Drug Free Facilitator ssist in the overall drug education program at your chool? [A] very little [B] some [C] a great deal					
. To what extent do you use the Drug Free audio- isual library and materials? [A] very little B] some [C] a great deal					
. To what degree was the reservation and elivery process for AV/materials satisfactory? A] very little [B] some [C] a great deal					
. To what degree is communication between Drug ree Schools and your role as School Team Chair atisfactory? [A] very little [B] some C] a great deal					
OTE: Answer question 8 here --->--->--->					

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

SCANTRON® FORM NO. F-236

© SCANTRON CORPORATION 1988
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DRUGFREE SCHOOLS PROGRAM
Drugfree Services Survey
May 1991

• EXAMPLE
• ERASE COMPLETELY TO CHANGE

29

LEMENTARY TEACHERS
LEASE: Answer all 11 questions

	A	B	C	D	E
. My school is: [A] Public [B] Non-Public					
. What grade level is your school? A] Elementary [B] Middle/Junior High [C] High chool [D] Other					
. To what extent are you aware of the services f the Drug Free Schools program in your school? A] very little [B] some [C] a great deal					
. To what extent are you aware of support groups t your school? [A] very little [B] some C] a great deal					
. To what extent do your students in need articipate in support groups? [A] very little B] some [C] a great deal					
. To what degree does the Drug Free Facilitator ssist in the overall drug education program at your chool? [A] very little [B] some [C] a great deal					
. To what extent do you use the Drug Free udio-visual library and materials? [A] very little B] some [C] a great deal					
. To what degree was the reservation and elivery process for AV/materials satisfactory? A] very little [B] some [C] a great deal					
. To what extent have you included Project harlie on a weekly basis? [A] very little B] some [C] a great deal					
0. To what degree does the School Team Chair oncept facilitate the drug education program at our school? [A]very little [B]some [C]a great deal					
1. To what extent was the one hour mandated ubstance abuse inservice or the Project Charlie nservice useful to you as a classroom teacher? A] very little [B] some [C] a great deal					
OTE: Answer question 11 here --->--->--->					

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

SCANTRON® FORM NO. F-236

©SCANTRON CORPORATION 1988
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

3588 C995 5 4 3 2 1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Analysis of Data
Camp Abbey Surveys
DFSCA

Purpose: To assess the effectiveness of the Camp Abbey REACH team retreat.

Objectives:
1. To gather descriptive data regarding participants.
2. To evaluate the sessions.
3. To analyze the free response data.

Participants: N = 120 students

Analysis of Data

I. Descriptive Data

A. Age Distribution for Participants

Age	# of participants	%
under 12	3	2%
12	28	23%
13	16	13%
14	24	20%
15	18	15%
16	20	17%
17	8	7%
18	2	2%
over 18	0	0%
coding error	1	1%

B. Grade Distribution for Participants

Grade	# of participants	%
6	2	2%
7	36	30%
8	23	19%
9	16	13%
10	24	20%
11	15	13%
other	4	3%

C. Ethnicity of Participants

Ethnicity	# of participants	%
Am. Indian	3	2%
Asian	6	5%
Black	37	31%
Hispanic	5	4%
White	69	58%

D. Sex of Participants

Sex	# of participants	%
Female	91	76%
Male	26	22%
Coding errors	3	2%

E. School Location for Participants

Location	# of participants	%
East Bank	52	43%
West Bank	67	56%
Coding errors	1	1%

Session Data

A. Totals

Directions for completion of this portion of the survey were: For questions 6 through 11 indicate the degree to which you have gained knowledge.

Session Title	Very Little	Some	Great Deal	Coding Error or No Response
Alcohol	6 (5%)	27 (22%)	87 (73%)	0 (0%)
Tobacco	20 (17%)	59 (49%)	36 (30%)	5 (4%)
Marijuana	4 (3%)	38 (32%)	74 (62%)	4 (3%)
Cocaine	14 (12%)	49 (41%)	50 (42%)	6 (5%)
Steroids	37 (31%)	60 (50%)	22 (18%)	1 (1%)
Stimulants, etc.	16 (13%)	55 (47%)	43 (36%)	5 (4%)

B. Responses Distributed by Grade Levels

For the purpose of analysis, two grade level groups were created. These groups were: 1) students in grades 6,7,8 and 2) students in grades 9,10,11. These groupings approximate a middle/junior high and a high school split. Note: The totals in this section do not equal N as two variables were required in order to interpret the responses, i.e., to be included in this section, a student had to answer both the session item and the grade level item.

Delimiter: 1) Those students coding "other" in the grade level item were not included as it was impossible to place the student in a specific grade level. 2) The group totals do not reflect equal set size. Therefore, proportional differences were noted - not raw data variances.

*See attachment A for raw data.

Observations:

1. The distribution of responses for item 6, Alcohol, shows a similarity across grade levels. There is no significant difference between the reported acquisition of knowledge between the middle/junior high group and the high school group with both groups indicating a high level of knowledge acquired, i.e., learned "a great deal". Note: The figures for response choice C reflect the highest overall rating for all topics listed in attachment A.
2. The data in item 7, Tobacco, show most students rated the content in the mid-range in terms of new knowledge. The differences between groups was minor with one exception. A number of students (13) in grades 6-8 reported learning "very little" new knowledge re: tobacco.
3. A difference is noted between the middle/junior high students and the high school students in their response to item 8, Marijuana, choice C. The overall numbers for choice C are high and the difference between groups is significant.
4. The responses for item 9, Cocaine, are similar in trend to those reported in item 6, Alcohol.
5. Item 10, Steroids, shows the most significant variance in data. The high school response total of 20 for choice A is the highest in this response category. The middle/junior high response total was also high indicating that both groups did not learn much new knowledge re: steroids. The response total for item 10, choice C, was the smallest reported and is consistent with the other figures for the item.
6. The responses for item 11, Stimulants, etc. are interesting in that the middle/junior high students reported a lower level of new knowledge in choice C than the high school students.

C. Responses Distributed by Age

For the purpose of analysis, two age groups were created. These groups were: 1) ages under 12, 12 through 14 and 2) ages 15-18. These groupings approximate a middle/junior and a high school age range. Note: The totals in this section do not equal N as two variables were required in order to interpret the responses, i.e., to be included in this section, a student had to answer both the session item and the age item.

Delimiter: The group totals do not reflect equal set size. Therefore, proportional differences were noted - not raw score variances.

*See attachment B for raw data.

Observations:

1. The distribution of responses for item 6, Alcohol, shows the highest single total with 51 students in the younger group indicating a high degree of new knowledge acquired. This figure is both the highest in any category as well as the highest in choice C. It should be noted that both groups reported a high level of new knowledge re: alcohol.
2. The differences between groups in item 7, Tobacco, indicate that students have some knowledge re: tobacco with the younger group less informed.
3. There is a significant difference between the group responses in item 8, Marijuana, especially in columns B and C with both groups indicating a high level of new knowledge acquired.
4. The differences in age group responses for item 9, Cocaine, should be noted. The similarity between the totals for B and C in the younger age group are also notable.
5. The data in item 10, Steroids, are the most significant in that both age groups appear to be knowledgeable about steroids. Additionally, the disparity between the age groups in column C is one of the largest in the table.
6. There is a significant difference between the responses in column B for item 11, Stimulants.

D. Responses Distributed by Sex

Analysis in this section is based on comparisons between the responses of males v females. Note: The totals in this section do not equal N as two variables were required in order to interpret the responses, i.e., to be included in this section, a student had to answer both the session item and the sex variable item.

Delimiter: The set sizes are unequal. Therefore, observations are predicated on relative variance and not raw data totals.

*See attachment C for raw data.

Observations:

1. For item 6, Alcohol, the data show that the females reported a high level of new knowledge re: alcohol. This total, 65, was the highest in the table and is one of three significant figures found in attachment C. Note: Although the female totals are high, a review of the male totals shows that males had a proportionally higher new knowledge total in this item than did the females.
2 Seventeen (17) females reported little new knowledge acquisition in the area of Tobacco, item 7. The remaining response totals show an even distribution in columns B and C.
3. In the area of Marijuana, item 8, neither males nor females reported a high entry level knowledge base with both groups reporting high totals in column C. The female total of 54 in column C indicates a high new knowledge base for the females.
4. Thirteen (13) females reported "very little" new knowledge acquired in the area of cocaine. This is significantly different from the totals reported by the males. Note: Females are evenly split in the other two columns while boys reported a slightly higher number in column C than in column B.
5. The steroid figures, item 10, show a high number of females who acquired "very little" new knowledge in this area. The data from the males are evenly distributed.
6. The distribution of totals for item 11, Stimulants, reflects the same pattern for males evident in the other items. The female totals show a slightly higher number who acquired "very little" new knowledge, column A.

REACH Team Data

I. Schools

A. School Population

N = 29 schools

26 Public Schools (secondary only)
3 NP Schools*

*Participation by non-public schools was voluntary.

B. Distribution of Schools

1. Public
   a. 22 reported REACH team activities (See attachment A.)
   b. 3 schools did not submit reports: Marrero, Truman, and Worley
   c. 1 public school was exempted due to its unique student population (John Martyn alternative school)
2. Non-Public
   a. 40 schools involved in over-all DF program (1990-91)
   b. 3 schools reported REACH team activities: Blenk, St. Agnes, and St. Cletus (Also listed in attachment A.)

II. Demographic Data

A. Sponsors = 30 adults (See Part 3 of REACH Team Data printout.)

B. Students
1. Mean number of students actively involved each month: 570 (See attachment A.)
   i. Public school monthly average: 537 students
   ii. Non-public school monthly average: 33 students
2. Total number of REACH team participant contacts: 3529*
   * Sum of membership at each school for each month reported. (See Part 1 of REACH Team Data printout for membership.)
3. Total number of cards received: 153 (See attachment B - monthly reporting calendar.)
4. Ethnicity distribution of REACH team members:

American Indian	<1%
Asian	4%
Black	29%
Hispanic	5%
White	61%

5. Sex distribution of REACH team members:

Females	78%
Males	22%

D. Activities Data

1. Meetings: 558 REACH Team meetings during 1990-91 year.
2. REACH Team Activities:
   a. 1619 student contacts - Reach Team Room
   b. 855 student contacts - One-to-One
   c. 2337 student contacts - Support Group Sessions
   d. 4759 student contacts - Other activities (See REACH team monthly report summary-Printout #2 for descriptions.)
3. School visits by REACH Team Members: 11 schools*
   *One REACH team sponsor reported visits to middle schools but did not indicate number or site of these visits.
4. Schools visited by REACH teams:

Al	Mc
Au	Wo
Gr	Cl
Pi	Wa
Es	Bo
Me	

5. Total number of student contacts via REACH team activities: 9570

Conclusions

1. Of the 22 public secondary schools (88%) reporting REACH team activities, 15 schools (68%) reported activities during at least 6 of the 9 months of the school year. Note: It is essential that each school report be evaluated individually as the level of activity and actual student involvement varied widely.
2. There was significant variance within the membership rolls with a range from 5 to 76. Note: The range within some schools also varied radically from month to month.
3. There was significant variance in terms of the number of monthly meetings held with Reach Team members. The lowest number reported was one meeting per month and the highest number reported was 20 meetings in a month.
4. The number of student contacts exceeded 9000 and the range of activities reported in "Other" column was broad.
5. Seven of the reporting public schools (22%) submitted cards for less than 6 months of the year with two schools, Harris and Roosevelt, submitting only two cards. Gretna Jr submitted cards for three months and Fisher, Adams, and Lincoln submitted 4 cards. Riverdale submitted cards for 5 months.
6. Two public schools, Adams and Fisher, reported activities for the first semester only.

Recommendations for Further Study

1. All public secondary schools should be encouraged to sponsor REACH teams as this is a component of the district's DF plan.
2. Efforts should be made to stabilize the activities across the school year.
3. The variances among membership counts within a school and across the district should be studied.
4. The variances among monthly meetings should also be studied.
5. Efforts to involve non-public schools should continue.
6. The activities section of the report should be reviewed as some reported activities may not be directly related to the DF program.